



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/908,081	07/18/2001	Ramanamurthy Dantu	062891.0570	4452

7590 08/03/2005
Terry J. Stalford
Baker Botts LLP
Suite 600
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201

EXAMINER

BHANDARI, PUNEET

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2666

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/908,081

Applicant(s)

DANTU ET AL.

Examiner

Puneet Bhandari

Art Unit

2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 1, related application numbers are needed.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims **1,4 & 7** objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim **1**, on line 3, "a wireless access network" should be replaced with "the wireless access network" and on line 8, "a call agent" should be replaced with "the call agent".

Regarding claim **4**, on line 3, "a wireless access network" should be replaced with "the wireless access network" and on line 10, "a call agent" should be replaced with "the call agent".

Regarding claim **7**, on line 3 " the logic" should be replaced with " a logic" and on line 4, "logic" should be replaced with " the logic" "a wireless access network" should be replaced with "the wireless access network".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,3, 4, 6, 7 & 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over La Porta et al. (US 6,434,134) in view of Womack et al. (US 6,438,114).

Regarding claim 1, Fig. 3 of La Porta et al. teaches a method of handling calls for a wireless access network comprising of

The step of receiving at a call agent (HA) of the wireless network a call origination for a mobile device is taught by step 170 in fig.3 and column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31.

The step of determining whether the mobile device is registered on the wireless access network (mobile device attached to the home network) is taught by step 174 in fig 3 or in column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31.

The step of determining if the mobile device is not registered (mobile device is not attached to the home network) disclosed in column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31 and determining at the mobility control function (DHCP server) whether the mobile device is active (power up) is taught by DHCP sever determines that the mobile device is powered up in column 9, lines 25-52.

The step of determining if the mobile device is active is taught by mobile device is taught by determining mobile is powered up in column 9, lines 25-52.

The limitation connecting call with a call agent (foreign agent) based on a Temporary line directory number (Care-Of Address-COA) assigned by the MCF (DHCP server) is taught by if the mobile device is not attached to home network connecting the

Art Unit: 2666

mobile device by Care-Of Address (COA) in column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31.

La Porta et al. fails to teach using session initiation protocol for exchanging messages between MCF and call agent. Womack et al. teaches Session Initiation Protocol for exchanging messages in wireless network (see column 1, lines 10-20 of Womack et al.). At the time invention was made it would have been obvious to a person in ordinary skill in art to add session initiation protocol of Womack et al. for exchanging messages between MCF (DHCP sever) and call agent (foreign agent) of La Porta et al. One in ordinary skill in art would have been motivated to do this since SIP standards are designed specifically for initiating, managing and terminating interactive IP sessions (see column 1, lines 15-20 of Womack et al.).

Regarding claim 3, 6 & 9 Fig. 3 of La Porta et al. further teaches if the mobile device is registered, retrieving profile information for the mobile device at the call agent in step 174 and 178 and column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31.

La Porta et al. fails to teach using session initiation protocol for exchanging messages between MCF and call agent. Womack et al. teaches Session Initiation Protocol for exchanging messages in wireless network (see column 1, lines 10-20 of Womack et al.). At the time invention was made it would have been obvious to a person in ordinary skill in art to add session initiation protocol of Womack et al. for exchanging messages between MCF (DHCP sever) and call agent (foreign agent) of La Porta et al. One in ordinary skill in art would have been motivated to do this since SIP standards are

designed specifically for initiating, managing and terminating interactive IP sessions (see column 1, lines 15-20 of Womack et al.).

Regarding claim 4, Fig. 3 of La Porta et al. teaches a system of handling calls for a wireless access network comprising of

The limitation means for receiving at a call agent (HA) of the wireless network a call origination for a mobile device is taught by step 170 in fig.3 and column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31.

The limitation means for determining whether the mobile device is registered on the wireless access network (mobile device attached to the home network) is taught by step 174 in fig 3 or in column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31.

The limitation means for determining if the mobile device is not registered (mobile device is not attached to the home network) disclosed in column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31 and determining at the mobility control function (DHCP server) whether the mobile device is active (power up) is taught by DHCP sever determines that the mobile device is powered up in column 9, lines 25-52.

The limitation means for determining if the mobile device is active is taught by mobile device is taught by determining mobile is powered up in column 9, lines 25-52.

The limitation connecting call with a call agent (foreign agent) based on a Temporary line directory number (Care-Of Address-COA) assigned by the MCF (DHCP server) is taught by if the mobile device is not attached to home network connecting the mobile device by Care-Of Address (COA) in column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31.

La Porta et al. fails to teach using session initiation protocol for exchanging messages between MCF and call agent. Womack et al. teaches Session Initiation Protocol for exchanging messages in wireless network (see column 1, lines 10-20 of Womack et al.). At the time invention was made it would have been obvious to a person in ordinary skill in art to add session initiation protocol of Womack et al. for exchanging messages between MCF (DHCP sever) and call agent (foreign agent) of La Porta et al. One in ordinary skill in art would have been motivated to do this since SIP standards are designed specifically for initiating, managing and terminating interactive IP sessions (see column 1, lines 15-20 of Womack et al.).

Regarding claim 7, Fig. 3 of La Porta et al. teaches a system of handling calls for a wireless access network comprising of

The limitation logic encoded in media is taught by determination if the mobile device is attached to Home network in column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31.

The limitation logic operable to receive at a call agent (HA) of the wireless network a call origination for a mobile device is taught by step 170 in fig.3 and column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31.

The limitation to determine whether the mobile device is registered on the wireless access network (mobile device attached to the home network) is taught by step 174 in fig 3 or in column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31.

The limitation to determine if the mobile device is not registered (mobile device is not attached to the home network) disclosed in column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31 and determining at the mobility control function (DHCP server) whether the

mobile device is active (power up) is taught by DHCP sever determines that the mobile device is powered up in column 9, lines 25-52.

The limitation to determine if the mobile device is active is taught by mobile device is taught by determining mobile is powered up in column 9, lines 25-52.

The limitation to connect call with a call agent (foreign agent) based on a Temporary line directory number (Care-Of Address-COA) assigned by the MCF (DHCP server) is taught by if the mobile device is not attached to home network connecting the mobile device by Care-Of Address (COA) in column 9, lines 54-67 and column 10, lines 1-31.

La Porta et al. fails to teach using session initiation protocol for exchanging messages between MCF and call agent. Womack et al. teaches Session Initiation Protocol for exchanging messages in wireless network (see column 1, lines 10-20 of Womack et al.). At the time invention was made it would have been obvious to a person in ordinary skill in art to add session initiation protocol of Womack et al. for exchanging messages between MCF (DHCP sever) and call agent (foreign agent) of La Porta et al. One in ordinary skill in art would have been motivated to do this since SIP standards are designed specifically for initiating, managing and terminating interactive IP sessions (see column 1, lines 15-20 of Womack et al.).

5. Claims **2,5 & 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over La Porta et al. (US 6,434,134) in view of Hartmaier (US 2002/0080751). La Porta et al. teaches all the limitation of claims 2,5 & 8 (see 102 rejection for claims 1,4 &7 respectively) except La Porta et al. does not expressly disclose when the mobile device

Art Unit: 2666

is not active, connecting the call to a voice mail server identified by profile information for the mobile device. Hartmaier teaches if the mobile device is not active forwarding the message to the voice mail server of the associated mobile (see paragraph 0032 lines 1-14). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person in ordinary skill in art to add voicemail functionality of Hartmaier (US 2002/0080751) to the mobile device of La Porta et al. One in ordinary skill in art would have been motivated to do this to route the call to the final destination (see Fig 4 of Hartmaier (US 2002/0080751)).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure are Warriar et al (US 6,707,809), Emery et al (US 5,353,331), Leung et al. (US 6,621,810), Foti et al. (US 6,751,204), Purandi et al. (US 6,708,031) and Lioy (US 6,665,537).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Puneet Bhandari whose telephone number is 571-272-2057. The examiner can normally be reached on 9.00 AM To 5.30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2666

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PB

Puneet Bhandari
Examiner
Art Unit 2666



D. KINGSTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER